IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

CASTLE HILL STUDIOS LLC (d/b/a CASTLE HILL GAMING); CASTLE HILL HOLDING LLC (d/b/a CASTLE HILL GAMING); and IRONWORKS DEVELOPMENT, LLC)	VIDEO GAMING TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,)
CASTLE HILL STUDIOS LLC (d/b/a CASTLE HILL GAMING); CASTLE HILL HOLDING LLC (d/b/a CASTLE HILL GAMING); and IRONWORKS DEVELOPMENT, LLC (d/b/a CASTLE HILL GAMING),)	Plaintiff,)
(d/b/a CASTLE HILL GAMING); CASTLE HILL HOLDING LLC (d/b/a CASTLE HILL GAMING); and IRONWORKS DEVELOPMENT, LLC (d/b/a CASTLE HILL GAMING),)	v.) Case No. 17-CV-00454-GKF-JFJ
CASTLE HILL HOLDING LLC (d/b/a CASTLE HILL GAMING); and IRONWORKS DEVELOPMENT, LLC (d/b/a CASTLE HILL GAMING),)	CASTLE HILL STUDIOS LLC)
CASTLE HILL HOLDING LLC (d/b/a CASTLE HILL GAMING); and IRONWORKS DEVELOPMENT, LLC (d/b/a CASTLE HILL GAMING),)	(d/b/a CASTLE HILL GAMING);)
IRONWORKS DEVELOPMENT, LLC) (d/b/a CASTLE HILL GAMING),)	CASTLE HILL HOLDING LLC)
IRONWORKS DEVELOPMENT, LLC) (d/b/a CASTLE HILL GAMING),)	(d/b/a CASTLE HILL GAMING); and)
(d/b/a CASTLE HILL GAMING),)	IRONWORKS DEVELOPMENT, LLC)
Defendants.	(d/b/a CASTLE HILL GAMING),)
))

ORDER

This matter comes before the court on defendants' Submission Concerning the Public Filing of this Court's Opinion and Order dated August 21, 2019 (Doc. 379) [Doc. 394] and plaintiff's Notice of Proposed Redactions to Docket No. 379 [Doc. 391].¹

"Whether judicial records and other case-related information should be sealed or otherwise withheld from the public is a matter left to the sound discretion of the district court." *Mann v. Boatright*, 477 F.3d 1140, 1149 (10th Cir. 2007) (citing *Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589 (1978)). "[W]here documents are used to determine litigants' substantive legal rights, a strong presumption of access attaches." *Colony Ins. Co. v. Burke*, 698 F.3d 1222, 1242 (10th Cir. 2012) (quoting *Lugosch v. Pyramid Co. of Onondaga*, 435 F.3d 110, 121 (2d Cir. 2006)). However, the presumption may be overcome "by demonstrating the pages contain 'sources of business

¹ Plaintiff submitted its proposed redactions to Doc. 379 in conjunction with its proposed redactions to Doc. 373. [Doc. 391].

Case 4:17-cv-00454-GKF-JFJ Document 416 Filed in USDC ND/OK on 11/01/19 Page 2 of

information that might harm a litigant's competitive standing." *Deherrera v. Decker Truck Line, Inc.*, 820 F.3d 1147, 1162 n. 8 (10th Cir. 2016) (quoting *Nixon*, 435 U.S. at 598).

Castle Hill does not object to the public filing of the Order. VGT requests only that the court redact one instance of the phrase "uniqueness testing algorithm." However, as previously determined by this court, the phrase "uniqueness testing algorithm," standing alone, does not rise to the level of confidential or proprietary information. Accordingly, the court declines to adopt plaintiff's proposed redaction. The court orders that docket entry no. 379 be unsealed.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 1st day of November, 2019.

GREGORY K. FRIZZELL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE